## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

MAY 1 0 2016

	SA	N FRANCISC	O DIVISION	SUSAN Y. SOONG
United States of America,		)	Case No. CR	CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
	<i>Plaintiff</i> , v.			ORDER EXCLUDING TIME SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Kamo	ran Azizi	) ) )		
	Defendant.	)	1	
For the reason Speedy Trial A by the continu 3161(h)(7)(A)	s stated by the parties on the react from \( \frac{5}{10}/16 \), ance outweigh the best interest. The Court makes this finding	to 5/3/// to 5/3/// to f the public a	and the defenda s continuance o	the Court excludes time under the and finds that the ends of justice served in in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § in the following factor(s):
	Failure to grant a continuance See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B	would be like (i).	ly to result in a	miscarriage of justice.
	The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).			
	Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).			
	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).			
X	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.  See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).			
	ED: My 10, 20/	5	Shi	np lgroto
STIP	OULATED: Attorney for Defer	2		ited States Attorney
	Automey for Defer	Iumit	I AUGIDIEMIN OIL	The transfer of the transfer o